UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/784,570	02/23/2004	Gregory Bondar	2230.1040000	1077

54089   7590   04/02/2008
BARDMESSER LAW GROUP, P.C.
910 17TH STREET, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, DUSTIN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/02/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _06 December 2007_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-33_ is/are pending in the application.

  4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-33_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _23 February 2004_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

  a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☒ None of:

  1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

  2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

  3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _08/30/2004_.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1 – 33 are presented for examination.

Priority

2.   Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an application

filed in Israel on 08/23/2001. It is noted, however, that applicant has not filed a certified copy of

the 145105 application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

Claim Objections

3.   Claims 1-29 are objected to because of the following informalities:

    I.   As per claim 1, "the domains" should be corrected as "the plurality of domains".

    II.   As per claims 1 and 18, "the service" should be corrected as "the Web service"

    III.   As per claims 1 and 18, "the standard protocol" should be corrected as "the

            standard communication protocol".

    IV.   As per claim 18, "the severs" should be corrected as "the plurality of servers".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5.   Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for

failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as

the invention.

    A.   The following terms lack antecedent basis:

        I.   the servers   -   claim 1.

        II.   the same encryption key   -   claims 16 and 25

    B.   The claim language in the following claims is not clearly understood:

        I.   As per claim 18, the claimed limitation of "connecting the client the

        server" is not clearly explained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

6.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 30-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed

to non-statutory subject matter. As per claim 30, "a wrapper" is being considered as non-

statutory since it is directed to software program. As such, software program alone is not a

machine, it is clearly not a process, manufacturer nor composition of matter [Please see MPEP

2106].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on
> sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8.   Claims 1-9, 11, 17, 18, 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by

R. Elz and P. Hethmon [Internet Draft, FTPEXT Working Group, "Extensions to FTP"] [

hereinafter as Elz].

9.   As per claim 1, Elz discloses the invention as claimed including a method for providing a

Web service by a plurality of domains, through a single IP address [i.e. for many domain

names to be allocated to a single IP address] [Chapter 6, paragraph 1], the method comprising:

        a) for each of the domains, allocating a server having a unique domain name and the IP

address, for providing the service;

        b) providing a wrapper [i.e. the front end FTP server as a wrapper] [Chapter 6.3, last

paragraph], the wrapper being a software module for intermediating between a client of the

service and the servers via a standard communication protocol for communicating with each of

the servers [i.e. a wrapper which waits for the HOST command and then invokes an older

server] [Chapter 6.3, last paragraph];

c) upon receiving a request for connecting a client to the one of the servers in order to provide the service [i.e. upon receiving the HOST command] [Chapter 6.3, first paragraph; and Chapter 6.3.2, first paragraph]:

(i) identifying the target domain name of the request by interacting between the client and the wrapper via the standard protocol [i.e. validate the hostname given represents a valid virtual host for that server] [Chapter 6.2, paragraphs 1-3; and Chapter 6.3, first paragraph];

(ii) mediating the interaction between the wrapper and the server providing the service which is associated with using the target domain name by the standard protocol [i.e. the wrapper invokes a RFC 959 compliant FTP server for the received hostname] [Chapter 6.3, last paragraph];

(iii) establishing a communication channel between the server and the client utilizing the standard protocol [i.e. validate the hostname and if so, establish the appropriate environment for that virtual host] [Chapter, 6.3, first paragraph]; and

(iv) allowing the server to provide the service to the client [i.e. 220 reply code as the code used on the initial connection established with "welcome' message] [Chapter 6.2, first paragraph; and Chapter, 6.3, last paragraph].

10. As per claim 2, Elz discloses wherein a username phrase being used includes a username and the corresponding domain name [i.e. USER and HOST] [Chapter 6.2, first paragraph; and Chapter 6.3.2, first paragraph], and the domain name is separated from the username by at least one character that does not conform with the standard characters allowed in a username in the standard protocol [i.e. % sign] [Chapter 6.2, first paragraph].

11.   As per claim 3, Elz discloses wherein the username phrase is "user%domain" or

"domain%user", in which "user" is the username, "domain" is the domain name, and "%" is any

character which does not conform to the standard protocol [Chapter 6.2].

12.   As per claim 4, Elz discloses wherein the Web services are any of HTTP, FTP, POP3,

SMTP, MIRC, Telnet, SSH, Rtelnet, and Shell [Abstract].

13.   As per claim 5, Elz discloses wherein each of the domains refers to a different Virtual

Dedicated Server [Chapter 6, paragraph 1 and 2].

14.   As per claim 6, Elz discloses the IP address is associated with a computer system running

any dialect of Unix, Solaris, Linux (Red Hat, Debian, SuSE, FreeBSD, etc.), AIX, HP/UX,

Tru64, or Irix [Chapter 8.5].

15.   As per claim 7, Elz discloses wherein each domain has its own instance of the server [

Chapter 6, second paragraph].

16.   As per claim 8, Elz discloses wherein the servers of at least some domains share the same

disk space [i.e. shares with one or more other hosts] [Chapter 6, first paragraph].

17.   As per claim 9, Elz discloses wherein only one instance of a server resides at a Host, and

is referenced by hard links from the domains [Chapter 6.2, paragraphs 1-3; and Chapter 7.5.2].

18.   As per claim 11, Elz discloses wherein the wrapper is kept active only until the requested

server is identified, and the communication is handed to the requested server [i.e. a wrapper

waits for the host command and then invokes an older server] [Chapter 6.3, last paragraph].

19.   As per claim 17, Elz discloses wherein the wrapper is provided with information related

to secured services of the target domain in plain text [Chapter 12].

20.   As per claim 18, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 1.

21.   As per claims 27-29, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 7-9.

22.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed
> in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for
> patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an
> international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this
> subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United
> States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

23.   Claims 30-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Goyal et al. [

US Patent No 6,976,258].

24.   As per claim 30, Goyal discloses the invention as claimed including a wrapper for

handling the connections of clients to a plurality of Web domains hosted by a single Host [i.e.

wrappers] [Figure 4C; and col 11, lines 3-19], in which the connection is handled over the

standard communication protocol [col 1, lines 14-23], the wrapper providing a buffer to each

socket for retaining temporarily information received from a client [col 11, lines 60-col 12,

lines 6; and col 15, lines 40-55].

25.   As per claim 31, Goyal discloses providing servers hosting the Web domain with

additional functionality by hooking a new shared library to an original shared library of the

standard communication protocol [i.e. dynamically link to the operating system as a module] [

col 8, lines 19-35].

26.   As per claim 32, Goyal discloses wherein during the connection, "read" commands read

the data from the buffer if it is not empty, or the data from the socket, if the buffer is empty [i.e.

a parse wrapper to parse read buffer] [col 15, lines 40-55].

27.   As per claim 33, Goyal discloses ignoring any write command until the buffer is empty [

col 14, lines 1-12].

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

28.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

29.   Claims 10, 12-15 and 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over R. Elz and P. Hethmon [Internet Draft, FTPEXT Working Group, "Extensions to FTP"] [

hereinafter as Elz], in view of Goyal et al. [US Patent No 6,976,258].

30.   As per claim 10, Elz does not specifically disclose wherein the wrapper is kept active for

an entire session when the communication channel is open. Goyal discloses wherein the

wrapper is kept active for an entire session when the communication channel is open [i.e. the

child process to service the request] [col 7, lines 29-48]. It would have been obvious to a

person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Elz and

Goyal because the teaching of Goyal would enable guaranteeing appropriate quality of service

to virtual processes executing on multitasking operating systems [Goyal, col 1, lines 6-9].

31.   As per claim 12, Elz does not specifically providing a new shared library including

additional functionality compared to the original shared library to which the standard

communication protocol refers. Goyal discloses providing a new shared library including

additional functionality compared to the original shared library to which the standard

communication protocol refers [i.e. pointer for insert the object code] [col 8, lines 36-col 9,

lines 37]. It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to combine the teaching of Elz and Goyal because the teaching of Goyal would enable

guaranteeing quality of service to virtual hosts servicing client requests to multiple network

addresses on a single physical host computer [Goyal, col 1, lines 9-12].

32.   As per claim13, Goyal discloses wherein the additional functionality of the new shared

library is added to the original shared library by hooking [i.e. dynamically link to the operating

system as a module] [col 8, lines 19-35].

33.   As per claim 14, Goyal discloses providing a buffer to each socket, for retaining

temporarily the information received from the client, and reading the data from the buffer if it is

not empty, or from the socket if the buffer is empty [i.e. a parse wrapper to parse read buffer] [

col 15, lines 40-55].

34.   As per claim 15, Goyal discloses ignoring any write command until the buffer is empty [

col 14, lines 1-12].

35.   As per claims 19-24, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 10-15.

36.   Claims 16, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over R.

Elz and P. Hethmon [Internet Draft, FTPEXT Working Group, "Extensions to FTP"] [

hereinafter as Elz], in view of Liu et al. [US Patent No 5,898,780].

37. As per claim 16, Elz does not specifically disclose wherein the same encryption key is used for all domains on each Host. Liu discloses wherein the same encryption key is used for all domains on each Host [col 7, lines 7-17 and lines 61-67]. It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Elz and Liu because the teaching of Liu on encryption would provide needed level of security to prevent unauthorized accessed.

38. As per claim 25, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 16.

39. As per claim 26, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 17.

40. A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire **3 (three) months and 0 (zero) days** from the mail date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will result in **ABANDONMENT** of the application (see 35 U.S.C 133, M.P.E.P 710.02, 710.02(b)).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dustin Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3971. The examiner can normally be reached on flex.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached at (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Dustin Nguyen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2154